

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 2-5. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-6, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-6.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 were originally pending in the application. Claims 1, 5-10, 12-14, 18-23 and 25-26 have been amended herein. Claims 2-4, 11, 15-17, 24 and 27-34 have been cancelled herein. Claims 35-39 have been added herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include reference characters mentioned in the description. Specifically, reference signs " 72 ", " 72' " and " D " representing the distance between the forming steel 70 and the bottom of the roller 62. Applicant notes that corrected drawing sheets have been attached displaying the missing reference signs in Figures 2-5.

### **SPECIFICATION**

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 9 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claim 9 to replace "said first tool" with "a first tool." Applicant has amended claim 22 to replace "said first tool" with "a first tool." Applicant has also amended claim 22 to now depend upon claim 19, thus establishing sufficient antecedent basis for "said extension" in line 1. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

#### **PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,324,880). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 14-16, 19-21 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,324,880) in view of Official Notice taken in computers with tool-driving programs. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "a positional pressure forming steel assembly operatively associated with said robotic arm for forming a short flange on a sheet material, said positional pressure forming steel assembly including a cylinder supporting a hub for relative sliding movement and a biasing element operatively disposed between said cylinder and said hub." Similarly, claim 14, as amended, recites "a positional pressure forming steel assembly operatively associated with said robotic arm, said positional pressure forming steel assembly having a cylinder supporting a hub for relative sliding movement, a biasing element operatively disposed between said cylinder and said hub and a tool steel which forms a short flange on said first sheet material by bending said short flange onto said second sheet material between said tool steel and

said material contacting portion.” The remaining claims have been amended to provide proper antecedent support based on the amendments to claims 1 and 14.

The positional pressure forming steel assembly provides a tool in which the position of the robotic arm relative to the nest dictates the applied pressure of the interface between the steel and the flange to be formed. In contrast, Nakamura relies on precise control of the drive cylinder 45 and the particular pressure generated by the piston rod 49, not the robotic arm. Nor can this limitation be considered a common technical means used in the art. The prior art alone or in combination fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the amended Claim 1 as evidenced by the Examiner indication that claims 4, 5 10-12, 17, 18 and 23-25 as originally filed were directed to allowable subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and dependant claims 6-8 and 13, as well as independent claim 14 and dependant claims 19-21 and 26, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 4, 5, 10-12, 17, 18 and 23-25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As noted above, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 14 to include the limitations of claims 2-4 and 15-17 respectively.

### **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

The Examiner cited but did not rely on US-7,254,973 B2 to Campian (Campian '973) in a Form PTO-892. This patent which was made of record but not relied upon is assigned to the assignee of the present application. In fulfillment of the continuing duty to disclose information which may be material to the patentability of the present application, Applicant is filing an Information Disclosure Statement and Form-1449 concurrently with this responsive amendment which lists the references cited in Campian '973, as well as the Office Action dated February 22, 2006 and the Responsive Amendment date August 28, 2006 from the prosecution history of Application S/N10/521,655 which issued as Campian '973.

### **NEW CLAIMS**

New claims 35-39 have been added to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 35 and 37 are similar in scope to other claims as originally filed (claims 6 and 19, respectively) with the exception of their claim dependency. Claims 36 and 38-39 further define the configuration of the tool steel used for forming the short flange.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

/ David A. McClaughry /

Dated: September 17, 2008

By: \_\_\_\_\_

David A. McClaughry  
Reg. No. 37,885

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

[DAM/LMB/pal]